

Fowlow, Jeffrey

From: Adena Hodgins [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2013 3:36 PM
To: Fowlow, Jeffrey
Subject: Fwd: EPA removal at Stubblefield property

Hi Mr. Fowlow, we believe that it would be best to take down the building also. Thanks Adena.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Daryl Schreiner <[d\[REDACTED\]](#)>
Date: Thu, Apr 11, 2013 at 9:05 AM
Subject: Re: EPA removal at Stubblefield property
To: Adena Hodgins <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>

Hi

David will attend the meeting this morning for us....also, do to the specific design of the building EPA is referring to, and considering the savings to demo it, it might be well to go ahead and have it removed. What do you and Brent think?

----- Original Message -----

From: [Adena Hodgins](#)
To: [Daryl Schreiner](#)
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 3:57 PM
Subject: Fwd: EPA removal at Stubblefield property

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Fowlow, Jeffrey <Fowlow.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Date: Wed, Apr 10, 2013 at 10:54 AM
Subject: EPA removal at Stubblefield property
To: "[REDACTED]"

Ms. Hodgins:

EPA is estimating that it may cost up to \$25,000 extra to excavate and backfill the contamination around the old shop building in a way that attempts to maintain its structural integrity. The costs for labor, materials, services, subcontracts, etc to keep the building is approximately \$60,000, whereas the cost to demolish and dispose of the building is approximately \$35,000.

This increased cost to retain the building is due to the cost of a structural engineer to assess the building's structural condition, the increased labor costs necessary to carefully excavate the contamination adjacent to the building's foundation, and the cost to backfill the excavation with special material (controlled density fill) that is a self-compacting, cement-like material used to provide foundation support in a large void (like an excavation).

EPA is considering the demolition of the old shop building to reduce the amount of cleanup costs (up to \$25,000). That said, we understand that you are working to market the property and the demolition and removal of the old shop building may affect these future plans. It is likely that this building will be viewed by a potential buyer as an eyesore and a liability. However, we wanted to give you the your real estate agents an opportunity to provide comments for our consideration before EPA makes a final decision.

Please let me know if you have an opinion regarding keeping this building or if you would prefer that it be demolished and removed.

Jeffrey Fowlow, PG, CHMM

Federal On-Scene Coordinator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900

Seattle, WA 98101

EMAIL: fowlow.jeffrey@epa.gov

Office: [206-553-2751](tel:206-553-2751)

Cell: [206-225-5582](tel:206-225-5582)